UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/384,072	08/26/1999	R. ADRIAN BISHOP	TAN99-17	7349

21005 7590 08/15/2003

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER
CHOW, CHARLES CHIANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2685	13

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/384,072	BISHOP ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles Chow	2685	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 July 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

**Office Action for
Applicant's Amendment
(7/31/2003)**

1. Regarding applicant's amendment, the final rejection has been withdrawn, based upon the no teachings for: the multiple simultaneous data flow to/from wireless remote transceivers are transmitted over a shared subscription based wireless link to communication over a network; the aggregating data flows from multiple remote transceivers and transmitting the aggregated information of the data flows over a shared subscription based wireless link.
The ground of rejection has been changed to include Schweickart et al. (6,252,883 B1).

Schweickart et al. (also as Schweickart in below) teaches the multiple simultaneous data flow to/from wireless remote transceivers are transmitted over a shared subscription based wireless link to communication over a network. Because Schweickart teaches the multiple simultaneous communication from automobile 24, data device 30, motel 28, home 11, factory 31 to local hub 42 (abstract, figure in cover page/Fig. 1; col. 1, lines 14-18; col. 1, lines 35-47; col. 2, line 66 to col. 4, line 4; the hub receives multiplexed packet transmission from at least one data device, col. 7, lines 22-30). Schweickart teaches the relaying data via local hub 42 to the packet data system 45 hospital or clinic, internet, and utility, over the shared cellular PCS packet data communication link 44 (as shown above).

Regarding the aggregating data flows from multiple remote transceivers and transmitting the aggregated information of the data flows over a shared subscription based wireless link,

Schweickart teaches the hub 42 aggregates data at 100 Kpbs information from different customers, 24, 28, 30, 31 for data delivery to designated address (col. 1, lines 35-59). Schweickart teaches the hub 42 transmitting aggregated information from different customers, 24, 28, 30, 31, on shared link 44 to packet system 45 (as shown above).

Regarding portable hub, it has been shown in last office action that Sopko teaches the portable hub 226 in Fig. 3B, and Sopko teaches the portable hub 216 (title, abstract, figure in cover page) for users at computer 130 to share portable network server 120. The portable 120 has transmitter and receiver for communicating within the network system (his claims 14, 15, 1, 9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasanen (WO 9/22,493) in view of Terho (EP 0,663,785 A2), and further in view of Rypinski (US 5,461,627) and Schweickart et al. (US 6,252,883 B1).

Pasanen discloses **claim 1**, a method for communication of data (a wireless LAN network 5 for transferring information, abstract) between a plurality of remote transceivers (peripheral

devices 6-15, Fig. 1). A WLAN network 5 based data flows over multiple types of communication links disposed there between (Fig. 1, the type for linking from access-point-server-device 1, using short range distance frequency 4, SDRF, to peripheral devices 6-15 through agent; the type of link from access-point-server-device 1's RF 2 to mobile/other wireless network 3, abstract, page 1, lines 4-14, page 6, lines 19 to page 7 lines 38).

Pasanen discloses the method for establishing a private short-range wireless communication link (SDFR) between the plurality of remote transceivers (peripheral devices 6-15) and a hub (the WLAN 5 links peripheral device, such as portable computer 15, video camera 13, printer 6, telecopier 7, CD-ROM 8).

Pasanen discloses the providing at least one hardwired communication link over which data flows are established between the hub (the connection from SDRF 4, through control 4d, to RF 2, Fig. 1) and an access unit (server device 1, Fig. 1).

Rasanen discloses the supporting data flows over a subscription-base wireless communication link (the mobile network 3, Fig. 1; the long distance link module to GSM mobile communication system, page 7, line 4-9) between the access unit (server device 1).

Pasanen does not clearly indicate the base station.

Terho teaches the base station is in communication with network, as shown in Fig. 3, the LAN access 1 having data interface 15 for communicating with base station BTS4 for data transferring between LAN and the radio telephone network (abstract), using the data interface 15 (page 2, lines 1-30; page 3, lines 24-35). Terho clearly indicate the essential

component, the base station BTS4, for communicating with LAN access point (data interface 15) between the subscriber based network having MSC2 and the LAN 1, as shown above, for the data transfer. It would be obvious to include the base station 4, to Rasanen, such that the network has the essential component, base station, for providing the communication link to the network 3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Pasanen, and to include Terho's base station, such that the LAN could communicate with the network using the base station.

Rypinski teaches the access unit has the capacity of holding more than 4,500 messages/ second (col.12, line 30-33; the memory buffer in col. 15, lines 32-37 and col. 18, lines 26-34; the data length, data accumulation and service priority in col. 19, lines 1-10). Rypinski teaches the hard-wired communication link between hub and access unit (title, abstract, figure in cover page, Fig, 1) with the hardwired connection from ceiling mount access point to the hub controller. Rypinski teaches the hub controller is providing the peer to peer connectivity (figure in cover page) between the server outside (Fig. 1) and remote laptop computers in Fig. 1. It would be obvious to include Rypinski's data length aggregation capacity, to Pasanen above, such that the system could be operating efficiently with aggregation capacity to avoid the collision. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Pasanen above and to include Rypinski's data length aggregation capacity, such that the system could be operating efficiently with aggregation capacity to avoid the collision.

Regarding the multiple simultaneous data flow to/from wireless remote transceivers are transmitted over a shared subscription based wireless link to communication over a network, Schweickart et al. (also as Schweickart in below) teaches the multiple simultaneous data flow to/from wireless remote transceivers are transmitted over a shared subscription based wireless link to communication over a network. Because Schweickart teaches the multiple simultaneous communication from automobile 24, data device 30, motel 28, home 11, factory 31 to local hub 42 (abstract, figure in cover page/Fig. 1; col. 1, lines 14-18; col. 1, lines 35-47; col. 2, line 66 to col. 4, line 4; the hub receives multiplexed packet transmission from at least one data device, col. 7, lines 22-30). Schweickart teaches the relaying data via local hub 42 to the packet data system 45 hospital or clinic, internet, and utility, over the shared cellular PCS packet data communication link 44 (as shown above).

Regarding the aggregating data flows from multiple remote transceivers and transmitting the aggregated information of the data flows over a shared subscription based wireless link, Schweickart teaches the hub 42 aggregates data at 100 Kpbs information from different customers, 24, 28, 30, 31 for data delivery to designated address (col. 1, lines 35-59). Schweickart teaches the hub 42 transmitting aggregated information from different customers, 24, 28, 30, 31, on shared link 44 to packet system 45 (as shown above). Schweickart teaches a efficient technique of handling the multiple user's data service by utilizing the shared communication link 44 at hub 42 to packet data system 45 with cost effectiveness (col. 1, lines 21-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Pasanen above, and to include Schweickart's

multiple access for data service and hub 42, such that the system could handle plural users' service with low cost.

3. Claims 2, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasanen in view of Terho, Rypinski-'627, Schweickart, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of O'Sullivan et al.(US 5,487,069).

In the above, it does not include the subchannel data transfer rate is less than the nominal data transfer rate.

O'Sullivan teaches **claim 2**, the making available a plurality of subchannels link for data transferring rate on each subchannel is typically less that the nominal data transfer rate of any data flow (the peer to peer wireless LAN having the capability of transmission under multipath condition between LAN and the mobile transceivers, as shown in title, abstract, Fig. 4. In Fig. 4 it shows the plurality of hub 8 in communication with mobile transceiver 9. The subchannels has a low bit rate but the total overall bit rate is high to overcomes the problems of delay time and inter symbol interference as shown in col. 7, line 66 to col. 8, line 8; The simultaneous operation of low bit rate transceivers and high bit rate transceivers is to allocate half of the available high bit channel to the low bit rate transceiver. The low bit rate transceiver utilize only half of the available bandwidth and a hub can transmit data at the low rate to two transceivers at the same time. The same hub for low bit rate and the high bit rate in col. 12, lines 16-23). It would be obvious to include O'Sullivan's subchannel for low data rate and high data rate transfer to Pasanen, such that the system could efficiently allocate the

subchannels to improve the multipath problem in the transmission path (col. 2, line 5; col. 2, line 19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Pasanen, and to include O'Sullivan's allocating subchannel with low, high, data rate, such that the system could improve the multipath problem.

Regarding **claim 3**, referring to examiner's comment in claim 2 above for the allocating available subchannel for the high speed data transfers over two or more subchannels (hub simultaneously transmits at low rate to two transceivers, and the high overall data transferring rate among hubs 8 connected to networks for gateway 11 and ISDN 12).

4. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasanen in view of Terho, Rypinski-'627, Schweickart, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rypinski (US 5,907,544).

In the above it does not include the details for the hub is based on an IEEE 802.11 standard. Rypinske teaches **claim 4**, a hub is based on the IEEE 802.11 standard in the hub controller and the multiple wireless network access point (title, abstract) for data transfer between the hub and the access points 71 (Fig. 1-5). The system is based upon the IEEE 802.11 (col. 1, line 33; col. 1, line 45; col. 2, line 32), or based upon the IEEE LAN standard 802 (col. 12, line 55). It would be obvious to include Rypinske's hub controller using the IEEE 802 LAN standard 802 for the system, such that the system could be popularly implemented

because many equipment are adopting the IEEE 802, and also because of the already available features in the standard 802 LAN. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Pasanen, and to include Rypinske's IEEE LAN standard 802 for hub controller link, such that the system could be popularly implemented according to the IEEE 802 standard, and benefited by the available features from IEEE 802 standard.

Regarding **claim 5**, referring to examiner's comment in claim 4, above, for the IEEE 802.3 standard as shown in Fig. 4, 802.3 for the medium access, 802.3, physical.

Regarding **claim 6**, O'Sullivan has shown above the private wireless link supporting multple high speed data transfer for the remote transceivers from the hubs 8 to mobile transceivers 9 using mixed high, low, data rate for the same time to communicate with the two mobile transceivers.

Regarding **claim 7**, Pasanen discloses the subscription-bases wireless link is also a long-range wireless communication link, as shown above the server device 1 communicate with network 3 using long distance module (page 7, line 4-11).

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasanen in view of Terho, Rypinski-'627, Schweickart, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rai et al. (US 6,421,714 B1).

In the above it does not include the details for the subscriber-based high speed link.

Rai et al. (also as Rai in below) teaches **claim 8**, the subscriber-based wireless communication link is also a high speed wireless communication link (the wireless data network for point-to-point server for efficiently manage the mobility for internet access, title, abstract, Fig. 6). Rai shows in Fig. 6 that the remote access point 82R are connected to wireless hub 84 for communication with other end system, which is different from the end system in the trunk sectors 1-3. The remote access involving the high speed packet transferring , since the high speed feature supports the whole point-to-point network link (col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 17). It would be obvious to include Rai's high speed feature for the point-to-point network link to Pasanen's system, such that the system certainly would be upgraded for efficiently transferring the information using the high speed feature. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Pasanen, and to include Rai's high speed feature for point-to-point network link, to Pasanen's system, such that the system could be upgraded to efficiently transferring the information using the high speed feature.

6. Claims 9, 10, 12, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasanen in view of Terho, Rypinski-'627, Schweickart, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Budin et al. (US 5,276,703).

In the above it does not include the details for the subscriber-based high speed link.
Budin teaches **claim 9**, the remote transceiver (44) are operably linked to remote computer terminals (36a-c) in communication with network (local area network including hub units,

subscriber stations, and a wireless communication link between each hub unit and its stations (abstract, Fig. 4). The hub 30 provide the remote computers 36a-c to be accessed by remote transceivers communicating with transceiver 44 (col. 7, lines 42-53). Besides, Budin also considered the spread spectrum (col. 21, lines 3-7); the IEEE 802.3 (col. 7, line 64 to col. 8, line 2); the 2.4 GHz link (col. 6, lines 47-58; col. 12,lines 48-53). It would be obvious to include Budin's remote computers 36a-c to provide computer resource services to remote transceiver via hub units to Pasanen, such that the remote computer resources could be conveniently accessed by via hub. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Pasanen above, and to include Budin's remote link to remote computers via hub, such that the system could be upgrade to conveniently access to resource in the remote computer.

Regarding **claims 10, 12, 15,** Budin has shown above, the wireless LAN system utilizes the direct sequence spread spectrum (col. 12, line 48-53) for the short range hut wireless LAN communication to the transceivers 36c, 3d, 38c, using 2.4 GHz (col. 12, lines 48-53) over unique channel from the link means for each of said hub units and its associated station units (col. 22, lines 22-31). Budin considered the Ethernet link (Fig. 3; col. 7, line 64 to col. 8, line 2) for the wired ring IEEE 802.3 network system.

7. Claims 11, 13, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasanen in view of Terho, Rypinski-'627, Schweickart, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jusa et al. (Us 6,031,863).

In the above it does not include the frequency hopping for the hub link, although Budin has shown the hub's communication link is using the spread spectrum direct sequence and the 2.4 GHz (claims 10, 12, 15).

Regarding **claim 11,** Jusa teaches the wireless LAN system utilizing the frequency hopping as shown in abstract, Fig. 1-9, and the hopping controllers 13a-b. Jusa's wireless LNA system periodically hops and varies the carrier frequencies (col. 4, lines 43-51) such that to avoid the overlapping collisions between cells. It would be obvious to include Jusa's frequency hopping to Pasanen's system, such that Pasanen's system could avoid the collision problem. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Pasanen above, and to include Jusa's frequency hopping for the hub wireless LAN, to Pasanen as modified above, such that the system could avoid the collision problem.

Regarding **claim 13,** Pasanen has shown above the short range infrared communication.

Regarding **claim 14,** Rai has shown above the wireless internet access system above (title, summary of invention) for the internet network.

8. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasanen in view of Terho, Rypinski-'627, Schweickart, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rai and Newton (Newton's Telecom Dictionary-1998).

In the above it does not include the details for the 1.9 GHz.

Newton teaches **claim 16**, the 1.9 GHz for personal communication network PCN is equivalently in personal communication system PCS and PCS comprises the 1900 MHz band as shown in Newton's page 567. Rai has shown above (Fig. 4), the remote access points AP 82 is communicating with end system other than trunk access point AP 86. The remote end system is another network system other that the end system in wireless trunk sector 1-3. Rai considers the PCS cellsite for base station (col. 6, lines 9-15) and PCS, in above, comprises the 1900 MHz band. Thus, the base station is a PCS system using 1900 MHz band. It would be obvious to include Rai's PCS band for base station to Pasanen, such that the system could be upgrade for PCS system also. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Pasanen, and to include Newton's PCN/PCS 1900 MHz, to Pasanen above, such that the system could also handles the PCN/PCS band.

Regarding **claim 17**, referring to the examiner's comment in claim 1 above, Pasanen has disclosed the long distance link for the cellular second type link greater than 1 mile.

Regarding **claim 18**, referring to the examiner's comment in claim 1 above, Pasanen has disclosed the wireless LAN network 5, as shown above.

9. Claims 19-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasanen in view of Terho, Rypinski-'627, Schweickart, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of O'Sullivan, Fefer, Rai, and Budin.

Regarding **claim 19**, referring to the examiner's comment in claim 1 above for the

method for establishing first link between remote and Hub; the transmitting data message to hub; the routing data message received by hub; the establishing second link from sever device 1 to network 3, and reformatted to including extra physical layer, stripping extra physical layer (the link agents, the means for generating a predetermined linked agent 4d, 16d; the means for transmitting the generated link agent; the means 4b, 16b for receiving link agent means from Pasanen, page 26, line 9-14; page 7, lines 11-12). Pasanen also has disclosed the routing of data is the original data message to network (in the examples 1, 2, page 6, page 23; the setting up a link connection, page 14; the operating example in page 20), and Terho considered the base station for the subscriber-based network.
Regarding the amended portion, aggregating data messages; form multiple logical data flows generated by remote computers, referring to Rypinski-'627 in claim 1 above.

Regarding **claims 20, 21**, referring to the examiner's comment in claims 2, 3 above for the rate is less than the nominal data rate; the high speed allocated subchannel data transfer.
Regarding **claims 22, 23, 24**, referring to the examiner's comment in claims 4, 5, 6 above for the IEEE 802.11, 802.3; the high speed data transfer for the remote mobile transceivers 9.
Regarding **claims 25, 26, 27**, referring to the examiner's comment in claims 7, 8, 9 above for the long range link; the high speed link; the linked to remote computer in network.
Regarding **claims 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33**, referring to the examiner's comment in claims 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 above for the spread spectrum; the FHSS, DSSS, 2.4 GHz over unique single channel; the infrared; the internet; the Ethernet.

Regarding **claims 34, 35, 36**, referring to the examiner's comment in claims 16, 17, 18 above for the1.9 GHz link; the greater than 1 mile, long distance link; the wireless LAN.

10. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasanen in view of Terho, Rypinski-'627, Schweickart, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Moelard (US 5,636,217)

In the above it does not include the details for the date message in reverse order.
Moelard teaches **claim 37**, source routed bridged LAN by access points and forwarding packet data for mobile stations (abstract, Fig. 1-4). Moelanrd considers the inserting the routing information in reverse order to data to be transmitted from mobile stations in second group to the mobile station in the first group [col. 7, line 59 to col. 8, line 20; col. 8, (f)], such that the routing information could be update due to mobile changed location (abstract). It would be obviously to include Moelart's reverse order message to update the mobile's location, to Pasanen, such that the system could provide the correct routing information in a special reversed order to efficiently distinguish the routing information for communication of data messages. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Pasane, and to include Moelard's reverse order messages to Pasanen as modified above, such that the system could efficient identify the routing information for the data transfer in LAN.

11. Claims 38-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasanen in view of Terho, Rypinski-'627, Schweickart, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sopko (US 6,003,068).

Regarding **claim 38**, referring to examiner's comment in claim1 above for the hard wired communication link is part of a contention network from Rypinski.

Regarding clai**m 39**, referring to examiner's comment in claim1 above for the peer to peer connectivity is supported between serves on the network and computers coupled to the remote transceiver 120 (Sopko and Rypinski).

Regarding **claim 40**, referring to examiner's comment in claim1 above for the base station and the aggregated data flow processing control from Rypinski for routing the data message through the network with the service priority consideration.

In the above it does not clearly indicate the hub and access unit is portable.

Regarding **claim 41**, Sopko teaches the portable hub and access unit. Sopko teaches the portable hub 216 (title, abstract, figure in cover page) for users at computer 130 to share portable network server 120. The portable 120 has transmitter and receiver for communicating within the network system (his claims 14, 15, 1, 9). Sopko provides the solution for a portable hub with transceiver for sharing with the user's computer device for access the network resource. It would be obvious to include Sopko's portable hub with transceiver, such that the system could be operated efficiently at different places by using the portable hub setup for accessing the network resource. Therefore, it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Pasanen above, and to include Sopko's portable hub with transceiver, such that the system could be operated efficiently at different places by using the portable hub setup for accessing the network resource.

Regarding **claim 42**, referring to examiner's comment in claims 1, 19, 38 above for the hardwired link contention.

Regarding clai**m 43**, referring to examiner's comment in claims 1, 19, 39 above for the peer to peer connectivity.

Regarding **claim 44**, referring to examiner's comment in claims1, 19, 40 above for the base station and the aggregation of data flow for routing though the network.

Regarding **claim 45**, referring to examiner's comment in claims1, 19, 41 above for the portable hub and subscriber unit.

Response to Arguments
And
Conclusion

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding applicant's argument based upon the no teachings for: the multiple simultaneous data flow to/from wireless remote transceivers are transmitted over a shared subscription based wireless link to communication over a network; the aggregating data flows from multiple remote transceivers and transmitting the aggregated information of the data flows

over a shared subscription based wireless link. The ground of rejection has been changed to include Schweickart et al. (6,252,883 B1).

Schweickart et al. (also as Schweickart in below) teaches the multiple simultaneous data flow to/from wireless remote transceivers are transmitted over a shared subscription based wireless link to communication over a network. Because Schweickart teaches the multiple simultaneous communication from automobile 24, data device 30, motel 28, home 11, factory 31 to local hub 42 (abstract, figure in cover page/Fig. 1; col. 1, lines 14-18; col. 1, lines 35-47; col. 2, line 66 to col. 4, line 4; the hub receives multiplexed packet transmission from at least one data device, col. 7, lines 22-30). Schweickart teaches the relaying data via local hub 42 to the packet data system 45 hospital or clinic, internet, and utility, over the shared cellular PCS packet data communication link 44 (as shown above).

Regarding the aggregating data flows from multiple remote transceivers and transmitting the aggregated information of the data flows over a shared subscription based wireless link, Schweickart teaches the hub 42 aggregates data at 100 Kpbs information from different customers, 24, 28, 30, 31 for data delivery to designated address (col. 1, lines 35-59). Schweickart teaches the hub 42 transmitting aggregated information from different customers, 24, 28, 30, 31, on shared link 44 to packet system 45 (as shown above).

Regarding portable hub, it has been shown in last office action that Sopko teaches the portable hub 226 in Fig. 3B, and Sopko teaches the portable hub 216 (title, abstract, figure in

cover page) for users at computer 130 to share portable network server 120. The portable 120 has transmitter and receiver for communicating within the network system (his claims 14, 15, 1, 9).

In view of the disclosures, claims 1-45 are remaining in the rejection manner.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Chow whose telephone number is (703)-306-5615.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Hunter, can be reached at (703)-308-6732.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to: (703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Charles Chow

March 07, 2003.